Original Meeting Agenda

Meeting Goal: Set working agreements and develop and order discussion topics to ensure the Work Group fulfills its planning objectives.

- Develop working and communications agreements (15 minutes)
- Discuss and agree on higher order principles that will help guide and ground planning work (15 minutes)
- Review and discuss what we have learned – data and lessons from the pilot (30 minutes)
- Identify and discuss critical homeless service, policy and system components to support the selection of topic areas – include overview of IBM, 10 Yr. Board, PSH and other relevant documents (30 minutes)
- Develop and order topics across the six-month planning process and, as possible, develop draft objectives for each meeting (30 minutes)
- Wrap-up, next steps (15 minutes)

Working Agreements

- We bring our expertise to the table and keep individual/organizational interests in check
- We look beyond individual span of influence and seek to benefit the system, and people it serves, overall
- We allow each other to respectfully disagree with our points of view, and agree to be open to healthy and honest dialogue to ensure all ideas are heard
- We seek to surface and clarify our own and others' assumptions to better understand what might be "under" a stated idea or recommendation
- We actively seek clarity on ideas expressed from others and summarize what we think we hear to better ensure agreement and understanding
- We state our non-negotiables honestly, but remain open to change and compromise
- We hold these discussions in confidence, do not share proceedings with those outside this group, and do not reach out to each other between meetings for the purposes of attempting to influence the course of discussions
- We defer to the facilitator to help him/her manage discussions and ensure that all people are heard
- We have equality of voices around the table so that each person can be heard and not a few dominate

Decision Making and Working Group Product

- The group is not charged with making binding decisions. The working group will develop a plan that staff will present to City Council. To the extent possible, members will seek to reach consensus on issues when there are different points of view across participants and present options, or staff will make a recommendation that acknowledges the differences in opinion in the group and the reasons for the recommendation.
- Some decisions can be made in this group and implemented when they are within the authority group members already have
- The Working Group process should result in a plan which is practical to implement locally and addresses the "on the ground" problems of day and night shelter. However, the plan and those practical solutions must incorporate and be in the context of the larger vision for the system.

Guiding Principles

About Populations and Services

- Prioritization of population(s) – it is important to prioritize populations to help us determine how to target and focus resources and service delivery.
    - Need to clearly define populations
- In general, we have a focus on chronic and most vulnerable populations
    - Should make attempts to "right-size" needs to population
- Resources are prioritized for local residents, chronic/heavy users of local emergency services and those willing to engage in services to the best of their abilities. Those with minimal investment in the community who are "passing through" are a lower priority and are encouraged to seek services in their home communities when possible
    - We may, however, need to shelter people who are not residents

About the Service Delivery System

- The homeless service system should incorporate evidence-based practices including coordinated entry, common assessment and coordinated case management utilizing by-name lists
- Short-term emergency services are a gateway to more sustainable solutions for individuals and families, with a primary focus on exiting people from homelessness
- Systems should maximize accessibility and efficiency and minimize duplication
- Consistent behavior and criteria requirements should be in place throughout the system and clearly communicated. Overflow shelter may be supported, but not alternative shelter that is inconsistent with system goals and objectives
- Emergency services in Boulder cannot serve an unlimited number of people and should not be expanded at the expense of more focused efforts to provide sustainable pathways out of homelessness
- Clarity about day and night service entry points with consistent coverage

- Services system design should incorporate the nexus of mainstream services including health, justice and other human services (for example, within a social determinants health framework) and include a strong behavioral health focus
- The crisis response system should be understood and measured with significant emphasis on how it contributes to reducing homelessness in the community and sustainable solutions within the context of safety and weather conditions.

On Evaluation and Measurement

- Quality, efficient data tracking and analysis should be designed into the system, to inform system-level understanding of outcomes and characteristics of people served
- Data solution must be interoperable with region and ultimately apply to populations beyond chronically homeless adults
- We need to continually strive to develop better and more sophisticated information and use this to derive CQI processes
    - Differences between people encountering safety net and actually using and benefitting from it
- BH/County data on high, low, medium frequency users can be mined to better understand the profiles and service utilization patterns
    - Run HU list against that data
- Commitment to mapping information – including jail/muni court

On Regional Context and Scalability

- We leverage resources across the region, such as Continuum of Care efforts, and also seek out support from federal sources
- The system, wherever possible, should be designed to be scalable such that it can be ramped up to be county-wide solution
- We need to consider how we develop a model and system that is sustainable within the community context and given the available resources

Other Notes from the Discussion of Principles

- Do we frame the larger community response in terms of needs, or what we think the community should have based on community size, data and values?
- We need to set clear benchmarks, which should be based on the data we currently have and then assessed based on evaluation data
- It is important to set housing targets: not having targets makes us vulnerable to other competing needs
- We need to de-link targets regarding housing stock vs. services
- We need to fully understand our specific target populations and determine what works in helping them move toward an exit from the system

- We don't really have an emergency system right now – why the community needs an emergency system needs to be defined – we recognize that we have to have something as there are real impacts to the community by not having these services in place
- While we are defining a continuum, we have the responsibility to define its/our capacity – whatever that might be, there is still an upper bound to the capacity

<u>Noted strategy related tensions that may require ongoing examination</u>

The group identified a number of inherent tensions that accompany this planning work. The group acknowledged that it will be important to discuss these as they emerge over the course of the work. Some of these include:

- Local vs. Regional planning perspectives
- Short vs. Long term solution focused approaches
- Organizational vs. Governmental perspectives on service needs (as well as those reflecting the variety of stakeholders at the table)
- A focus on heavy users and also emergency services (particularly in the context of wanting to limit/focus service delivery given resource constraints) How do we say no one freezes and no one is hungry and then define the size of the system – these are in conflict with each other

November 16 Agenda and Assignments (Some items changed post meeting.)

Date	Topics	Action Items
11/16	● **Presentations** o Inventory of what we have at each step in the continuum – where are there stressors, funding, etc. o Additional data (e.g., BH information) o Mapping of information to inform the system ● **Discussion of pain points in the City** ● **Key elements of service system model and prioritization – reaching consensus** o Targets for day shelter, etc. ● **Overnight shelter, overflow and summer shelter – needs and linkage to larger system**	● Greg and Wendy to develop information regarding the service delivery continuum ● Jason, Isabel and Daphne to review additional BH client data and brief Jim ● City to develop list of pain points ● Group to discuss priority populations and how these will drive planning processes ● Group will discuss key elements and develop preliminary targets for overnight shelter, overflow and summer shelter

Additional Decisions

- Note: we will invite the Boulder Housing Director to this meeting.
- We are also in the process of identifying a client representative and we will decide at what point it makes most sense to bring this person in.
- The City will take a pass at the first set of facilitator proposals and then will work with the workgroup to make a final decision on the top candidates.

Update on Short Term Solution

- BOHO is shortening its service hours - 5-6 hour days and longer when there are blizzards
- Currently does not have a location for Friday daytime services – is negotiating this with some potential places, but has not firmed this up yet
- Don't have a consistent place for Saturday nights - only have about 6 nights for Saturday firmed up as of now. This will become a problem, potentially, after the 16th of November
- Overflow shelter will not be formally linked to the virtual lottery system – still a possibility, but not in the near future
- BH will contract with BOHO for day shelter - volunteer coordination will be assumed by BH
- There is still a need to work out messaging with respect to shelter services provision within the community